

# **EXHIBIT 7**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

BEARBOX LLC and AUSTIN STORMS,	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	
	)	C.A. No.
LANCIUM LLC, MICHAEL T.	)	21-534-MN-CJB
MCNAMARA, and RAYMOND E. CLINE,	)	
JR.	)	
Defendants.	)	

- - - -  
Wilmington, Delaware  
Tuesday, November 29, 2022  
Pretrial Transcript  
- - - -

BEFORE: HONORABLE GREGORY B. WILLIAMS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

- - - -

Michele L. Rolfe, RPR, CRR

**APPEARANCES:**

**ASHBY & GEDDES**  
**BY: ANDREW C. MAYO, ESQ.**

**-and-**

**MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP**  
**BY: BENJAMIN T. HORTON, ESQ.**  
**JOHN LABBE, ESQ.**  
**For the Plaintiffs**

**BARNES & THORNBURG LLP**  
**BY: WILLIAM BURTON, ESQ.**  
**MARK C. NELSON, ESQ.**  
**ADAM M. KAUFMANN, ESQ.**  
**DERRICK HOOKER, ESQ.**  
**For the Defendants**

1           Moving to Lancium's first motion in limine,  
2           which is a motion in limine to preclude expert testimony  
3           inconsistent with the Court's claim construction ruling and  
4           to include new expert testimony or opinions outside the  
5           scope of expert's reports.

6           That motion is granted in part; denied in part.  
7           Defendant's motion in limine number one is granted in part  
8           to the extent it seeks to preclude Dr. McClellan from  
9           testifying inconsistently with the Court's *Markman* opinion.  
10          Ultimately, any concern of prejudice can be adequately  
11          addressed during trial by proper objection or through  
12          cross-examination of Dr. McClellan.

13          Defendant's motion in limine number one is  
14          denied in part as moot based on the Court's November 23rd  
15          order striking Dr. McClellan's supplemental report.

16          Moving to Lancium's motion in limine number two,  
17          which is a motion in limine to preclude plaintiffs from  
18          using pejorative terms like "thief, theft, steal, stealing  
19          or robbery."

20          Defendant's motion in limine number two is  
21          denied as moot. Conversion is no longer a claim to be tried  
22          and this is no longer a jury trial.

23          Moving to Lancium's motion in limine number  
24          three, motion in limine to preclude any argument or evidence  
25          regarding discovery disputes. The ruling is that neither

1       see you for trial on Tuesday.

2                       (Whereupon, the following proceeding concluded  
3       at 3:26 p.m.)

4                       I hereby certify the foregoing is a true  
5       and accurate transcript from my stenographic notes in the  
6       proceeding.

7                                       /s/ Michele L. Rolfe, RPR, CRR  
8                                       U.S. District Court  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25